

---

PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements

---

1-1-1948

## Should Americans back the Marshall plan?

Joseph Robert Starobin

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism>  
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact [STARS@ucf.edu](mailto:STARS@ucf.edu).

---

### Recommended Citation

Starobin, Joseph Robert, "Should Americans back the Marshall plan?" (1948). *PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements*. 595.  
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism/595>

*Should Americans  
Back*

**THE  
MARSHALL  
PLAN?**

*by* **JOSEPH STAROBIN**



## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Joseph Starobin, author of this pamphlet, is the foreign editor of the *Daily Worker* and the *Sunday Worker*. His regular column on foreign affairs, as well as lectures for the Jefferson School of Social Science and for many organizations, are well-known to thousands of American progressives. Mr. Starobin reported the United Nations conference at San Francisco and has covered its proceedings since. In 1947, he visited Latin America twice, and his reports on developments there were widely commented on. He is a former foreign editor of *New Masses*, and a regular contributor to its successor, *Masses & Mainstream*.

---

*Published by* NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS, 832 Broadway,  
New York 3, N. Y., February 1948

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

## I

Sounds good, doesn't it?—a plan for the economic reconstruction of Europe.

Big plans appeal to the American imagination. And the idea of reconstruction strikes a sound, solid note; we Americans like to think of construction, of building. And helping other people out of the jam in which the war left them—that, too, appeals to our generosity, our ideals of doing good for others.

The trouble with the Marshall Plan is—*that it isn't any of these things*. It isn't a plan. And it won't reconstruct Europe. Somebody is trying to put something over, not only on other people, but on us Americans.

And it will cost us plenty—in terms of our living standards, our civil liberties, the respect of other nations and friendship of other people, if we let the “somebodies” who are trying to put this over get away with it.

Before long, a large part of Europe may be so disorganized and chaotic that new-style Hitlers will come to the top. In the end, this hoax of a plan may cost the world another war. Yes, American boys fighting against other people. In the end, such a war could lay waste America, too.

## II

How did the Marshall Plan start?

Some people think it was just a bright idea which Secretary of State George C. Marshall threw out in a speech



at Harvard University on June 5, 1947. But it started before that.

It began when the United States broke up an organization called the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—we know it better under the name of U.N.R.R.A.

The late Fiorello LaGuardia was the head of it, and it was a pretty effective way of putting the war-torn countries on their feet. It was a truly international set-up, with all the eastern European countries (those who really felt the war hardest) in it. The United Nations ran it. But the State Department killed it.

On July 26, 1946 Assistant-Secretary William Clayton pronounced the dirge on U.N.R.R.A., and then said: *"The proper solution for any country that may require assistance is to apply to another country which in its opinion is able and prepared to furnish this assistance."*

That was a pretty blunt way of saying: "Come over to Washington and Wall Street. We'll look you over, and decide for ourselves whether you get help, how much, and on what terms."

That's only part of how the "Marshall Plan" started. The rest of the story lies in the disagreements over the shape of the post-war peace. The men who run our country didn't like the fact that in eastern Europe, a new type of government was coming to be—anti-fascist governments, led by the workers themselves, who had nationalized the big industries, and were beginning to do some real planning.

Wall Street and Washington didn't like the fact that the working people of Italy and France were bidding for power, that Communists were in the governments of those countries. They didn't like the fact that Soviet Russia was holding the United States to the war-time agreements as far as Germany was concerned. Wall Street and Wash-



ington didn't want to see reparations from Germany go to rebuild Eastern Europe; neither did they want to share control of western Germany (the Ruhr) with the Soviets, as had been agreed in Roosevelt's day.

When the Moscow conference in the spring of 1947 broke down over the refusal to live up to war-time commitments, Mr. Marshall and his main Republican adviser, Wall Street lawyer, John Foster Dulles, finally decided on trying to organize Western Europe *against* Russia and Eastern Europe.

The idea was to threaten the Soviet Union and her allies: *"Either you do as we say, or we'll organize the rest of the world against you."* That, after all, was the heart of President Truman's famous Doctrine as early as March, 1947—even before the Moscow meeting foundered.

In other words, the Marshall Plan was a political and economic strategy from its very beginnings. It still is to-day as we shall see.

Right after Marshall's come-on speech at Harvard, the British and French governments took their cue. The Soviet Union sent its delegates to Paris to look the thing over. And the Soviet diplomats said they would have nothing to do with the "Plan" for one main reason: *they did not like the idea of fitting their own economies, and the economics of Eastern Europe, into a project in which Wall Street and Washington would have the final say.*

After defending their own way of life for 28 years and building Socialism very painfully against the hostility of the whole world, Stalin and Molotov had no intention of turning control of their economic destinies over to the men of Wall Street and Washington.

*We would be willing, said Molotov, to draw up estimates of what we need and negotiate regular commercial loans with the United States. But we are not willing to give Wall Street and Washington the levers of*



control. The other Eastern European countries made the same decision: "Better to rebuild the hard way, by tightening our own belts, than to give up our economic independence after having fought a hard war for it."

What remained at Paris was a collection of sixteen nations.

And who are they?

One of them is Austria, formerly part of the German Reich. A peace treaty hasn't even been written for her.

Two of them are Turkey and Portugal, fascist states which aided the Axis. As the State Department admits on page 79 of its explanation of the Marshall Plan, both these countries "*had quick dollar resources as of June 30, 1947, equal to, or in excess of their needs.*" In other words, there's no real pressing reason to offer them dollars.

Three other members of the 16 were Switzerland, Sweden, and Ireland, all of them neutrals and two of them pretty heavy war-profiteers.

Then there is fascist Greece, a war-time ally whose people surely deserve aid but who have been governed by a gang of quislings, operating in the interests of 3,000 rich Greeks. Of them, Raymond Daniell wrote in the N. Y. Times for April 5, 1947: "*The present regime is paralyzing the nation's economy and endangering its security. Greece faces a staggering budgetary deficit largely because of unwise spending and the omission to impose taxation and controls.*"

And then there were Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Norway, Iceland, Denmark, France, Italy and Great Britain.

Add—western Germany, and you have Marshall Plan countries.

As you can see, this is a pretty motley crew, leaving out an important part of Europe, where a good deal of the food and timber for Western Europe used to come from, and



where important centers of industry exist, as in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Soviet Union itself. From the beginning, therefore, the Marshall Plan *divided Europe—politically and economically.*

### III

Why, you might ask, were these particular countries in a jam?

Of course, the actual physical devastation of war was partly responsible. But for the most part these countries had made a big recovery from V-E Day. *The main reason for their jam is the attempt to rebuild their economies on the basis of capitalism, the same system which led them into crisis and war.*

And they are trying to rebuild on a capitalist basis at a time when that system is much weaker, and new parts of the world—such as Eastern Europe and colonial Asia—are pretty much closed to the capitalist way of doing things.

For example: in some countries, like Greece, the wealthy classes have such a complete grip on the economy that they will not even allow income taxes to be placed on them! How can anybody expect to balance the budget, to set aside funds for recovery, or to do the minimum planning when the wealthy escape taxes?

British agriculture had been neglected for half a century: the whole country was living off imperialist investments. But to pay for the war, these investments were cashed in—mostly to Wall Street. As a result, Britain has to import food, and has to boost her exports tremendously in order to earn the money to pay for imports. In England's case, the country is attempting to plan—unlike Greece—but a British revival on the old capitalist basis



means tightening up the empire so that it will take Britain's exports; it also means a trade war with the United States in order to sell exports in countries that will pay for them in dollars.

Or take France: here's another case where the black market runs riot, where a reactionary government refuses to develop its own agriculture, and where one-third of the national budget is spent on military matters, mostly for a war against the people of Indo-China, who want the right to determine their own affairs. The same can be said for Holland. Imagine how much of her resources are going for warfare against 60,000,000 Indonesians!

Most of these countries would not have to come to the United States for "Marshall Plan" help if the workers and the farmers were running those countries, if peace were made with the colonial peoples, if big military budgets were scaled down, if rationing and price controls and a crackdown on the black market were instituted, if they started some real business with Eastern Europe.

*Of course, if they did all these sensible things, our State Department and Congress would call them "Red" and "Communist." That is to say—the Marshall Plan is the high price for preventing other peoples from reorganizing their own affairs sensibly and economically.*

So long as the United States attempts to keep these peoples on the old capitalist basis, there will never be real recovery for them. And we shall pay through the nose for the attempt.

#### IV

Now let's look at the figures themselves.

After a whole summer's work, the 16 nations came up with a proposal that the United States give or lend the



equivalent of \$29.4 billion in goods over a four-year period.

Former Secretary Clayton rushed to Paris, and said that was altogether too high. The figure was scaled down to \$22.4 billion—which is a deficit that our country is supposed to finance directly or indirectly.

Then three separate committees, appointed by President Truman, went to work on the figures of the 16-nation group. The purpose was to determine what American resources are available and what the minimum aid for the 16 nations could be.

The most important committee, headed by Secretary of Commerce Averill Harriman, brought in the most important report—and it made quite a scaling-down of the 16-nation proposals. Finally in mid-December, Truman submitted his European Recovery Plan to Congress along with detailed analysis of what it means by the State Department.

Here are some of the results:

First of all, the Marshall Planners would give real priority to the rebuilding of the German Ruhr. As the Foreign Policy Association report for Dec. 15 says: *“High State Department officials have said in effect that the economic recovery of Germany is the heart of the Marshall proposal.”*

Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall told a House Appropriations Committee on Dec. 9, 1947: *“We are not trying merely to make western Germany self-supporting; we are called upon to make its potential industrial productivity the cornerstone of the European Recovery Program.”*

And Harriman's committee specifically rebuked the 16 nations for not giving western Germany sufficient priority.

According to economists Victor Perlo and David Ramsey in the *New Republic* for Jan. 12, 1948, the ex-



penditures for western Germany will reach 4.4 billion or 27 per cent of the entire project for all the sixteen nations.

Now nobody would object to raising German production—if it were done on the basis of unifying Germany and using some of her capacity to reconstruct Eastern as well as Western Europe, while eliminating her war industries.

But it's another matter when Germany is divided in half, when the Eastern European countries get nothing by way of reparations from the western part, and *when at the same time western Germany is to be revived more quickly than probably any other part of Europe. This immediately creates the danger that all Europe will again be forced to revolve around the German economy.*

Even then it would be one thing if the German workers and farmers, having settled their own scores with the big landlords and industrialists, were allowed to make their economy hum in the interests of helping other peoples; *it's another thing when the same crowd of industrialists who financed Hitler and the old landlord system remain, and it all becomes a branch office for Wall Street.*

Instead of a democratic Germany reviving to help revive a democratic Europe, something else happens: a reactionary Germany becomes an instrument in the hands of American Big Business, as a lever against Britain, France, and Eastern Europe, too.

Another basic fact about the Administration's E.R.P.:

It gives the Western European countries much less than they asked for, and doesn't give them the type of goods which will make for a real reconstruction of heavy industry.

Everybody understands that only those countries which have a real capital-goods expansion program can really be independent, and the 16 nations asked for help that would



mean expanding pre-war electric power by two-thirds and steel capacity by one-fifth.

*But the E.R.P. neither offers them heavy-goods expansion nor does it envisage that their standard of living as a whole will reach pre-war levels as late as 1952!*

The idea of restoring pre-war living standards was "so rapid an improvement" that the State Department said "it cannot be achieved." This should be contrasted with the Czechoslovak two-year plan, which will restore that country to pre-war levels by the end of 1948; or with the Soviet plan which will overcome the setback of terrific devastation by 1950.

It's plain the E.R.P.'s refusal to back heavy goods expansion simply means that Western Europe will tend to become a colonial area of American Big Business.

\* \* \*

And here are some figures: The Paris group asked 40,000,000 metric tons of bread grains over four years; the President only offers 23 million.

The Paris group asked for 12 million tons of fats; the United States offered two million.

The Paris group asked for \$1,200,000,000 for farm machinery so that Western Europe could increase its own farm production; the United States and Canada will give *half* that amount.

Or take basic equipment, like steel.

The Paris group asked \$400 million for steel expansion; the President cuts that figure to \$192 million.

As for steel scrap, none will be available.

The story of semi-finished versus finished steel is very interesting, and shows the strategy behind the Marshall Plan.

The Western European countries asked for 1,272,000 tons of *finished* steel in the 1948-49 period, but 2,863,000



tons of *semi-finished steel* so their own factories could fabricate it.

But the President offered exactly the reverse. He boosted the *finished steel* products from 1,272,000 to 1,802,000 tons in the first year while he cut the crude and semi-finished steel figures down to 1,266,000 tons from the 2,863,000 figure.

Taken over a four-year period, the Western European group asked for about 2,400,000 tons of finished steel and will be getting about 5,200,000—or *more than twice what they asked for*.

On the other hand, their requests for crude and semi-finished steel products were about one billion two hundred thousand tons, and they will be getting about half a billion—or *40 percent as much*.

Even I. F. Stone, who is for the Plan, admits in the *Nation* on Dec. 27, 1947: "*In steel, shipbuilding, factory construction, housing, and power the United States has lowered Europe's sights in deference to its own basic industries, which fear European competition.*"

In other words, this fancy recovery plan won't bring recovery to Western Europe at all: at the very best, it will leave Western Europe pretty much a satellite of Wall Street, dependent on western hemisphere food, while at the same time struggling—within the limits of a much smaller capitalist market—to keep itself alive against American competition.

## V

The "Plan" is so rigged that it will benefit Big Business in this country—and that's one good reason why American workers ought to look twice before they lend their support.

Here are some examples:



American Big Business would be able to buy up German and other Western European business firms, and pick up these assets cheap. For American workers this means that the same companies they work for here at home would own and exploit companies abroad. If Big Business here decides that it wants to break American trade unions, or lower wages, it could carry on lock-outs or even shut down plants, and still continue to draw super-profits from foreign investments, based on the exploitation of cheap labor.

Another example: while the President sharply cuts the allocations for the 16 countries in capital goods and food, he sharply raised the figures for the oil refining industry in Western Europe.

The 16 countries had asked for half a billion in refining equipment; the President takes into account "*allowances needed by United States companies within the participating countries*" and therefore proposes three times as much, or \$1,500,000,000.

In other words, the U.S. oil trust wants to sell crude oil from the Middle East in Western Europe, and also wants to dominate the refining plants there. So the government obligingly offers three times what the governments themselves asked for—with the understanding that it goes to the U.S. oil companies.

*In fact, the bill sent to Congress proposes to guarantee investments of the private trusts to the extent of \$850,000,000. Such guarantees would last for 14 years.*

Another device which favors Big Business is the guarantee of convertibility of foreign profits. Suppose General Electric buys into French factories or Italian factories. Its profits are quoted in francs or lire. Under French or Italian law, these profits may not be convertible into dollars very easily since the governments of these countries may be trying to save dollars for essential purchases. Or



they may wish to nationalize these plants. Under the Truman-GOP plan, all American companies would have convertibility of profits guaranteed out of the U.S. Treasury—a *device which practically makes these corporations sovereign outfits within other nations.*

A third benefit for Big Business is the proviso that foreign countries must make available any strategic minerals we may desire in payment for that part of the Marshall Plan which isn't an outright grant.

These countries get "help"—and we've seen how little, misdirected, and costly that help will be—only if they hand over nickel from New Caledonian mines, or uranium from the Belgian Congo, or copper from British Rhodesia. Under such a scheme it will be easy for the State Department to name the terms of trade and make them very favorable to the United States.

## VI

Now let's see just how this so-called Plan gives the United States the *Levers of Control* over the affairs of other nations, how it would interfere in their internal politics.

From the very outset, the Marshall Plan was announced as an anti-Communist measure. Even before it goes into effect, countries like France and Italy have had to qualify for it by ousting legally elected Communist ministers, by undertaking to smash and divide the French labor movement and all the other reactionary things which have been happening in Western Europe. The Plan has already had the political effect which its authors desire—and that's one reason why European labor suspects it.

Moreover, in the hearings on the preliminary aid program on Nov. 12, 1947, Secretary Harriman was asked



what would happen if any country receiving aid "went Communist." He replied: "*We would lose interest in it—in that particular country—and deal with it as we are now dealing with countries in that situation.*"

This is a frank warning which interferes in other nation's affairs just as effectively as if an American ambassador chooses the governments for other people.

A second form of interference is the fact that the E.R.P. allows for a special assistant to the American administrator, who would be attached to the American embassy in each one of the participating countries. The scope of the program would be under his supervision—a sort of economic "gauleiter," just as the Nazis and the Japanese fascists used to have them in the countries they dominated.

Thirdly, the program is not a many-sided, or multi-lateral affair in which the United States makes available its help to a committee of 16 nations. *On the contrary, a bi-lateral pact has to be negotiated between the United States and each one of the 16 nations. In other words, it isn't really a co-operative plan: it is a pact in which each country must meet the terms of Washington and Wall Street.*

And when President Truman agreed with Senator Arthur Vandenberg that American appropriations should be on a year-to-year basis, instead of a four-year period, he made the whole thing even less of a Plan, and allows for even more dictation to each participant.

Obviously, no country can possibly plan for a single year. And by making it a year to year affair, Truman and Vandenberg can turn the screws on other nations on the penalty of not getting a penny for the following twelve months.

Fourth, each country must live up to a set of eight conditions. Some of these are general—like expanding pro-



duction, or stabilizing currency. Others are just keys by which the United States can unlock the gates to the domination of the trade and economic life of the country getting aid.

For example, the fourth condition speaks of "reducing barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries" as a pre-condition for signing a bi-lateral pact. Now many countries may find it necessary to protect their own industries by tariffs, just as we did for 75 years while our industry was being expanded, and just as we do now. But under this provision, the United States could force other countries to lower all barriers which protect their industries. American goods could flood and wreck other peoples' economies.

The fifth condition I have already mentioned—the stock-piling of *"materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own natural resources."*

The sixth condition sets up a currency pool—in the currency of other countries—equivalent to the value of all goods granted outright.

This pool *"shall be held or used for such purposes as may be agreed to between such country and the government of the United States."* Since the government receiving aid will be at the short end of the stick, these currency pools could be used for anything Washington or Wall Street wants—depressing the currencies of other countries, trade wars, financing civil wars, buying up local stooges, etc.

And No. 8 binds a recipient country to *"furnishing promptly, upon request of the United States, any relevant information which would be of assistance to the United States in determining the nature and scope of future operations under this Act."*



In other words, the affairs of all states would become an open book to the State Department—whether the costs of production, the extent of sales to non-participating nations, or any private affairs in economic dealings among nations or individuals.

In a speech on Dec. 18, 1947, to the Committee for Marshall Plan Aid at the Biltmore Hotel in New York, former Assistant Secretary William L. Clayton summed the whole thing up bluntly:

*"We will hold in our hands at all times the powerful sanction of discontinuance of aid if, contrary to our expectations, any country fails to live up to its agreement."*

No wonder the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries declined to come into this spider's web! For there are much more than "political strings" attached to the Plan—*there are steel cables binding a quarter of a billion people, and even more in the colonial world, to the decisions and destinies of Wall Street.*

Such is the shape of the Marshall Plan—and the heart of it is accepted by the majority of both Democrats and Republicans in Congress. Most of the Congressional differences over the Plan have been on non-essentials, a smoke-screen to cover up the basic agreement of the two major parties and their leaders.

For instance, it doesn't make much difference whether the State Department runs it, or a separate agency administers the Plan—the "big boys" will control it anyway. And the argument over just how much should be spent the first year isn't very substantial either. Even if the allocations are cut, the Administration has funds on which it can draw to make up the deficit.

Herbert Hoover's idea of drastically reducing the amount of capital goods to be sent to Europe, and demanding collateral from Europe in terms of "transferable property,"



was not a basic disagreement with the Plan; it's just a logical step in the same direction as the Plan itself, as the above analysis has shown.

Those liberals who pretend that there's a fundamental conflict between the Democrats and Republicans over reconstructing Europe, as though the former have the right idea and the latter the wrong idea, are largely kidding themselves: *what's worse, they're kidding the people.*

## VII

Now then, how much would the plan cost the American people?

The answer is: *plenty.*

The cost cannot be measured only in terms of money or even in terms of living standards, although that's where it may hit us most dramatically. There also are other types of cost which go into the moral and political budget of the nation. For example, civil liberties.

The Marshall Plan, as an extension of the bi-partisan reactionary foreign policy, is responsible for the current Red-scare and witch-hunt. Washington is a city of fear, and hundreds of thousands of government workers are being examined for "dangerous thoughts." In the hunt for Communists, not only are their rights—and any American has a right to be a Communist—being curtailed but liberals and democrats of all kinds are being deprived of constitutional protection. Trade unions have felt this under the Taft-Hartley Act, which is the logical counterpart of the Marshall Plan.

Americans are losing the respect of other people: a recent British poll shows that more and more Britons are coming to suspect and hate us. In China, the United States has replaced Japan as the object of popular hatred and



contempt; in France and Italy, it's coming to the same thing; in Greece, people are fighting us.

A poll of 62 Latin-American students studying in American universities now shows great hostility—just a fraction of what the peoples of Cuba, Puerto Rico, Chile, Brazil, and Panama feel.

And then there are the direct costs, the *pork-chop account*.

I don't have to cite the increased cost of living, now in its inflationary stages. Not all of this can be attributed fairly to the shortages created by the high level of exports abroad; much of this forest fire of high prices is due to the wrecking of price controls by both a Democratic President and a Republican Congress, and the refusal of both of them to restore such controls, thereby doing the bidding of Big Business.

*But in a situation where no controls exist, and where the big monopolies refuse to expand production, the shortages caused by high exports certainly contribute to inflation. As the Marshall Plan continues, inflation will, too.*

Then there's the matter of taxes. Whether the Truman proposal for a tax credit passes or not, the fact is that taxes are way higher than ever. That goes to pay for the "Plan."

And in addition to \$6.8 billion this year, goes the \$11 billion military budget, which is a back-stop for the Marshall Plan. In the 1948-49 budget, the Army, Navy and Air Force cost the average family of five about \$375 a year. Only one per cent of the budget is asked for education and one-tenth of one per cent for housing; but 28 per cent is going for the Army alone.

All that comes out of your pockets—not only in taxes; the corporations which also pay taxes manage to shift their costs to you—in *high prices*.



And then there are specific ways in which the Marshall Plan hurts specific sections of the community. Maritime workers, for example, will find that the effort to have foreign vessels carry much of the supplies is going to put them on the beach.

Small businessmen will find that shortages in steel hamper them more than the big fellows; "gray markets" and black markets are created which hurt the little manufacturer more than the big ones.

And farmers may think that boom markets for grains will help them; but how about the family-sized farmer, the producer of poultry, vegetables and such? He won't have boom markets at all, and will be competing with the Marshall Plan for feed. Moreover, what good does the boom do for some farmers when all industrial goods are high as a result of the "Plan"?

Even workers, who think they'll be kept working because of a high level of exports—let them stop to look beyond the tips of their noses. They are paying for what prosperity they seem to have now *in prices*; and they are letting American Big Business build up sources of super-profits in other countries, so that when Big Business wants to crack down on them, it will do so and continue to profit by exploiting foreign workers abroad.

A tremendous and vicious cycle is being built up by this "Plan"—a feverish boom, which is already based on civil wars in Greece and China, that will be followed by a fatal collapse, in which Big Businessmen will quickly try to move the country into *war*.

The Marshall Plan is already stimulating warfare in the eastern Mediterranean and the Pacific; it is threatening civil war in France and Italy; it is being accompanied by a fantastic military budget for a super-Navy, a super-Air Force, atom bombs and universal military training.



*Despite the boast that the "Marshall Plan" is the way to peace, the same men who are running it are at the same time clearly preparing for war. So little do they themselves believe their Plan will make for peace, that they simultaneously speed up the current warfare in Greece and prepare for even more fantastic adventures.*

Virgil Jordan, director of the National Industrial Conference Board, a Big Business research organization, put this very frankly when he told the Union League Club in Philadelphia on Feb. 12, 1946:

*"If any one complains that the dilemma implies or drives us to a type of imperialism which must end as all others have ended, let them make the most of it, for this time we have no other choice."*

Just think this ghastly sentence over. Jordan admits frankly that the present program is imperialism. He even admits that it will end in failure—and war, "*as all others have ended.*" But he tells us that we have no choice.

## VIII

But there is a choice. It's not the choice between the Marshall Plan and failure to reconstruct Europe—for it is perfectly clear that the Marshall Plan will fail.

It's not a choice between the Marshall Plan—and war . . . because that plan will lead to, and is already creating small wars, and the condition for World War.

But there is another way and, if it is taken in time, the American people can, must, and will avert the trap into which the German people were led by the German Virgil Jordans.

That way is to reverse and change our present foreign policy. And that requires building the People's Party which



Henry Wallace and all true progressives, among them American Communists, are supporting.

For we *could* have a foreign aid program which would really meet our own needs, keep our factories and farms going, and yet help the peoples of both Eastern and Western Europe.

Such a "get-practical" plan, as Henry Wallace called it, would require:

a) a decision to meet the Soviet Union half way on the political field, to sign a peace treaty based on sharing control of the German Ruhr. It would require calling off the wars in Greece and China, and scrapping the present policy of hostility toward the new democracies of Europe and the colonial peoples.

b) the allocation of American money—and the setting aside of goods—to an international organization, under the United Nations. It should never be forgotten that when the Soviet Union came to the original Paris conference it was perfectly prepared to submit a list of its needs to the U.N., and sign business-like contracts for repayable loans with the United States. Other peoples are prepared to do the same.

In fact, the U.N.'s Commission for Europe, which the President and the G.O.P. are completely by-passing, has estimated that proper help for Eastern Europe would not only rebuild that area quickly, but would help Western Europe.

Western Europe could save \$90,000,000 in timber imports from the United States if the United States would supply \$5,000,000 worth of special timber-cutting machinery to Eastern Europe.

In fact, if Poland were granted ninety millions worth of new coal-mining equipment, she could expand her coal production *three times as much as France could with a*



*similar amount, and twice as much as western Germany. And that would eliminate the need for a half billion dollars' worth of coal imports from across the Atlantic.*

c) a system of price controls and roll-backs, plus strict rationing and taxing the big corporations could accomplish such a foreign aid program and at the same time spike the inflationary pressures here at home. It could lower the American cost of living—which means increase the American standard of living.

We could have *plenty* in the United States, or fairly ration our scarce commodities. And we could at the same time aid those countries which are really rebuilding, and encourage the rest of the world to make a go of it on the same principles that are operating in Eastern Europe.

But all this can't be done by the two present parties.

And it can't be done by trying to fight progress by an anti-Communist crusade. It requires a peaceful settlement with those countries which are Communist, or moving in that direction.

It can't be done by trying to hold back the tides of anti-capitalism throughout the world, or by trying to run the United States in the interests of the capitalists, instead of the people.

American democracy and peace can be saved—only by rejecting the "Martial Plan," as Henry Wallace has called it, and adopting the Plan of Peace, and Production for Plenty in the United States and dovetailing it with the peace and production-for-plenty plans of other peoples.



## PAMPHLETS ON THE WORLD TODAY

---

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| U.M.T.—PROGRAM FOR PEACE OR WEAPON<br>FOR WAR? <i>by Leo Cooper</i> .....                                     | \$.05 |
| THE HERALD TRIBUNE'S 23 QUESTIONS ABOUT<br>THE COMMUNIST PARTY ANSWERED,<br><i>by William Z. Foster</i> ..... | .10   |
| TO SECURE JEWISH RIGHTS—THE COMMUNIST<br>POSITION, <i>by Alexander Bittelman</i> .....                        | .10   |
| JEWISH CULTURE IN AMERICA—WEAPON FOR<br>JEWISH SURVIVAL AND PROGRESS,<br><i>by Nathan Ausubel</i> .....       | .15   |
| CULTURE IN A CHANGING WORLD—A MARXIST<br>APPROACH, <i>by V. J. Jerome</i> .....                               | .35   |
| INSIDE JOB! THE STORY OF TROTSKYITE<br>INTRIGUE IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT,<br><i>by Herb Tank</i> .....           | .25   |
| TAX RELIEF FOR WHOM—THE NEEDY OR THE<br>GREEDY? <i>by Donald Freeman</i> .....                                | .03   |
| ENEMIES OF THE PEACE, PROFILE OF THE<br>HATE RUSSIA GANG, <i>by Sender Garlin</i> .....                       | .10   |



**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.**